

REMARKS

Claims 2-7 and 11-15 were pending. Claims 2, 5, 7, 11, and 15 have been amended for clarification purposes. Accordingly, claims 2-7 and 11-15 remain pending.

In the present Office Action, claims 2, 11 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,682,158 (hereinafter "Edberg"). Claims 3, 7, 12, 13, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edberg in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,819,303 (hereinafter "Calhoun"), and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,799,303 (hereinafter "Tsuchimura"). Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edberg, in view of Calhoun. Finally, claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edberg, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,583,761 (hereinafter "Chou"). Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections and submits each of the pending claims recite features neither taught nor suggested by the cited art.

For example, each of claims 2 and 11 recite the feature "wherein the multibyte binary words comprise a multibyte locale for the single byte language." Applicant submits this feature is neither taught nor suggested by the cited art. A locale refers to a language table of an internationalized application (Description, page 6, lines 1-2) which binds to the application at run time. This table "contains all language-specific processing information and conventions specific to a particular locale" (Description, page 5, lines 13-15). "A language table which requires that each character be represented by more than one byte is called a multi-byte locale" (Description, page 8, lines 17-19).

As may be appreciated, there are single byte languages, such as English, which use characters that can be represented using a single byte. There are also multi-byte languages, such as Japanese, that utilize more than 256 characters and therefore require more than a single byte for representation. As noted above, Applicant's claimed invention

recites a multi-byte locale for a single byte language. None of the cited art teaches or suggests such a feature.

In contrast, Edberg is directed to a code converter for converting between one character set and another character set. For example, in the following, Edberg teaches a process whereby characters of a source string may be converted to and from a Unicode encoding.

“The To-Unicode converter 2002 performs the code conversion process via To-Unicode converter 2002 which interacts with a scanner 2008. The scanner 2008 in conjunction with the scanner table 2010 scans the source string 2004 to chunk the source string 2004 into characters. Here, unlike the From-Unicode situation, the source string is simply divided into individual characters. The To-Unicode converter 2002 then uses a lookup handler 2012 to look up the individual characters so as to obtain Unicode encodings therefor. The lookup handler 2012 uses the mapping table 2014 to obtain the character in Unicode. Additionally, the To-Unicode converter 2002 may also use a fallback handler 2016. The fallback handler 2016 operates together with the mapping table 2014 to identify one or more characters in the target encoding that are able to be used as a fallback mapping for the text element in cases where the lookup handler 2012 has been unable to identify a Unicode character.” (Edberg, col. 22, line 54 – col. 23, line 4).

While Edberg includes teachings regarding the Unicode standard, it is noted that Unicode does not represent a multi-byte locale for a single byte language. Rather, the Unicode standard includes characters of all major International Standards approved and published before Dec. 31, 1990, as well as other characters not in previous standards. The above recited feature regarding a multi-byte locale for a single byte language is wholly absent from the cited art. Accordingly, each of claims 2 and 11 are patentably distinct from the cited art. Further, as each of claims 7, 14 and 15 include similar features, each of claims 7, 14 and 15 are likewise patentably distinct from the cited art. Finally, as each of the dependent claims include at least the features of the above mentioned independent claims upon which they depend, each of the dependent claims are believed patentable as well.

It is also noted that the dependent claims include further features neither taught nor suggested by the cited art. One such example includes claim 5 which recites “providing for display of said multibyte binary words so as to create a visual distinction between characters represented in said multibyte binary words and characters represented in ASCII.” In the present Office Action, Chou is cited as teaching this feature at col. 6, line 62 – col. 7, line 20. However, Applicant submits this is not the case. The cited portion of Chou is reproduced below:

“Referring back to FIG. 2, upon detecting that a translation is necessary, the Message Processor 37 shall activate the Language Translator 38. The translation is necessary if the first time a window is being painted since Message Processor 37 has been activated or the application has reset the window area. The Message Processor 37 constructs a structured storage area which reflect the layered windows painted by the designated application tasks. After the translation by the Language translator 38 is completed, the Message Processor 37 stores the replacement presentation as the current screen image in a structured storage area in RAM. When display related requests are again detected by the Message Processor, the Message Processor constructs the screen presentation image and compares it against the image stored in the structured storage area. The translation by the Language translator is performed on, and only on, the portions of the presentation where changes are detected. Subsequently, the image in the structured storage is updated to reflect the current presentation. The steps designed herein prevent unnecessary translations. The actual translation is being done by the Language Translator 38 which translates words, phrases and sentences utilizing the ASTT tables. The language translator can also utilize the font tables to determine the actual font 40 to be painted on the screen. The font designation is especially important for multiple byte characters such as Chinese and Japanese.”

Accordingly, Chou merely states that the choice of font is especially important for Chinese and Japanese characters. This teaching of Chou does not equate to the recited feature “providing for display of said multibyte binary words so as to create a visual distinction between characters represented in said multibyte binary words and characters represented in ASCII.”

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-82401/RDR.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

☒ Return Receipt Postcard

Respectfully submitted,



Rory D. Rankin
Reg. No. 47,884
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin,
Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: 10/13/04